REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-12 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3 and 5-11 are rejected. Claim 4 is objected to. Claim 12 is new.

The Examiner's acknowledgement of receipt of the claim for priority and copies of the priority documents is noted with appreciation.

The specification is objected to because it lacks headings or subtitles. Such headings or subtitles are recommended but not required by the MPEP. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully declines to add headings or subtitles.

The title is objected to as not being descriptive. Accordingly, the title is currently replaced with a new title which is appropriately descriptive of the invention.

Claims 1-3 and 5-9 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Daiku (U.S. patent 4,390,637).

Daiku discloses an X-Ray absorbing glass for a color cathode ray tube (CRT) panel, the glass having 0.1-5.0 wt.% Nd_2O_3 to provide substantially higher relative light transmission in the green and in the red wavelengths of the visible spectrum and a greater selective light absorption in the yellow region of the spectrum, and having 0.0005-0.05 wt.% Cr_2O_3 to control the chromaticity value of the glass to be nearly equal to that of the light emitted from tricolor phosphor P22 and to suppress the dichroism of the glass for different ambient lights.

Thus, Daiku's glass composition is specifically tailored for use as the panel glass in a CRT. Daiku does not teach or suggest that his glass composition could be used in an electric lamp.

In contrast, Applicant's claims 1-3 and 5-9 call for an

electric lamp or a component of an electric lamp comprising a glass of specified composition. Moreover, Applicant's claimed glass composition is critically different in several respects from Daiku's glass composition. For example, Applicant's glass composition does not contain any Nd_2O_3 or Cr_2O_3, both of which are essential components of Daiku's glass composition. Furthermore, Applicant's composition is substantially lead-free, while Daiku's composition contains up to 3 wt.% lead oxide (PbO). In addition, Applicant's composition does not contain any of the following components, all of which are called for by Daiku: ZnO, ZrO_2, TiO_2, CeO and Pr_6O_{11}.

With respect to claim 3, Daiku does not teach a range of 0.01-0.2 wt.% for CeO_2, but only teaches ranges of 0-3 and 0.1-1 wt.% for this component.

With respect to claim 5, Daiku does not teach a range of 14-16 wt.% for the combination of Li_2O, Na_2O and K_2O, but only teaches ranges for these oxides individually, and for Na_2O and K_2O combined, all of which ranges are different from those claimed by Applicant.

With respect to claim 6, Daiku does not teach a range of 10-12.5 wt.% for the combination of SrO and BaO, but only teaches ranges for these oxides individually, and for SrO, BaO, PbO, ZnO and ZrO_2 combined, all of which ranges are different from those claimed by Applicant.

Accordingly, the rejected claims are not anticipated by Daiku, and it is urged that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daiku in view of Filmer et al. (U.S. 5,925,582) (herein 'Filmer').

Filmer discloses a glass composition suitable for use in a fluorescent lamp envelope, which glass has a low sodium content

(<0.1 wt.% Na_2O), and is free of the toxic and/or corrosive components PbO, F, As_2O_3 and Sb_2O_3.

In contrast, Applicant's glass composition contains from 0.5-3 wt.% Na_2O. In addition, Filmer's composition contains from 2-6 wt.% Al_2O_3, while Applicant's composition contains less than 0.1 wt.% of this component. Moreover, Applicant's ranges of SrO and CeO_2 are different from those disclosed by Filmer.

Accordingly, Filmer's glass composition is significantly different from Applicant's, and it would not be obvious to use Applicant's glass composition in an electric lamp in view of the teachings of Filmer.

Furthermore, Daiku's and Filmer's glass compositions were developed for different purposes, and are therefore different from one another. For example, Daiku calls for 3-15 wt.% Na2O, while Filmer calls for less than 0.1 wt.% of this component.

Moreover, since Daiku's glass composition was developed specifically to meet the needs of a CRT panel, it would not be obvious to use Daiku's composition in an electric lamp.

Thus, the teachings of Daiku and Filmer are in conflict and would not be combined in the manner urged by a person skilled in the art.

For all of the above reasons, Applicant's claim 10 is patentable over the combination of Daiku in view of Filmer, and the rejection is in error and should be withdrawn.

The allowability of claim 4 if recast in independent form is noted with appreciation. Accordingly, a new independent claim 12 is presented incorporating the limitations of claim 1. However, in view of the above arguments, it is felt that claim 4 all of the pending claims are allowable in their present form.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests

that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all of the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

John C. Fox, Reg. 24,975
Consulting Patent Attorney
315-521-2627